



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

added, in order that the first fruits of jars of wine and oil may be assigned to the Egyptian prophets. The words *Maran-atha* and *Hosanna* must be popularized in the early Egyptian church assemblies, which are perfectly intelligible in Syrian churches, but the latter of them was not understood even by Clement of Alexandria with all his scholarship. All this in order to sustain a conjecture that Barnabas and the Apostolic Canons come from Alexandria, and because Clement of Alexandria quotes the Teaching! We might just as well say that the Teaching was written in Lyons or Rome because traces of it are found in Irenaeus and Hermas, or that the Shepherd itself is an Egyptian book because it is quoted, at a smaller lapse of time from its production than the Teaching, by Clement of Alexandria. And what can be more uncertain than the argument that the Teaching (which speaks of travelling prophets) must be Egyptian because Pantaenus was a travelling teacher?

But we must stop. With all our disagreement with the New York Professors we congratulate them on producing one of the best books yet written on the Teaching. At the same time we are glad that Bryennios is no longer, as in their first edition, a bishop of Ancient Mesopotamia, nor the Blessed Virgin engaged in a correspondence with Ignatius of Antioch.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Novum Testamentum Graece ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit apparatus criticum apposuit Constantinus Tischendorf. Prolegomena scripsit C. R. GREGORY, additis curis †EZRAE ABBOT. Pars Prior. Lipsiae, 1884.

This book, which forms the first part of the prolegomena to Tischendorf's eighth edition, carries the unfinished work of that scholar as far as the close of the description of the Uncial MSS of the New Testament. As regards Biblical learning, it is the highest point ever reached by American scholarship, and of its accuracy we can say that, considering how difficult it is to quote or collate MSS correctly, especially when as in N. T. criticism a statement is repeated by one writer after another without proper verification, it is one of the most exact books ever printed. This does not astonish any one who has seen Dr. Gregory at work, or who had ever the privilege of knowing his coadjutor,

“ . . . whose chair desires him here in vain,
However they may crown him elsewhere.”

Dr. Abbot's special gift was an *ἀκρίβεια*, which covered the whole ground from the reading of proof-sheets up to the highest problems which his science afforded. He was so anxious to be right in all he said, and so successful in accomplishing his desire, that it is not altogether to be wondered at that superficial observers have regarded the position which he took in N. T. criticism as somewhat conservative. Nor was his care in this matter confined to his own work. A burden of unexpressed gratitude is on our own minds as we reflect upon the many times in which we have received from him the advice of a master in textual criticism as to some point where our work was either incorrect or liable to misunderstanding; and there are many American students who can answer to a similar experience.

We have noted a few points in reading this first part of the Prolegomena, which may be useful to our friend, Dr. Gregory, in the next edition. If, in any

case we have assumed an erratum wrongly, he will remember that we are at present too far away from the great European libraries to verify all the points that may seem to us to be doubtful.

Pp. 137-8. Some notes will be found in Kopp, Bilder and Schriften, p. 171, where the order of the Gospels is given as Mc., Mt., Lu., Jo., on the authority of Victorinus (in Apoc), and the order Jo., Mt., Mc., Lu., on the authority of Ambrose.

Pp. 155-6. There are some errors in the description of the Euthalian chapters in Acts and the relation between the capitulations of \aleph and B. These will be best explained by reprinting a portion of a letter from Dr. Abbot, dated Oct. 22d, 1883. "I am much obliged to you for pointing out two errors in my list of the chapters which disagree in Euthalius and B. How the first, the substitution of 6 for 5 occurred, I do not know; I find 5 noted in my original memoranda correctly; whether it was changed to 6 in the MS sent to Germany, or by Dr. Gregory in his translation of it, or whether it is a typographical error, I do not know. It is as likely to have been my mistake as any one's. For the insertion of 27 I have some excuse: the edition of the Vatican N. T. published by Vercellone, after Mai (Rome, 1869), and Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Vaticanum* (Lips. 1867), agree in placing Ch. KZ in B at Acts XXI 14 instead of 15 as in Euthalius. These were the editions I used, unsuspectingly, in investigating the matter; but the Roman edition of 1868 shows that they are both wrong, and I am very glad to have the error pointed out."

It should, perhaps, be noted, with regard to the capitulation of Acts which \aleph and B have in common, that the Vatican MS missed one chapter in the process of subdivision, and that the scribe of \aleph apparently cut his subdivision short with the folio in which he found himself out of harmony with B. I had the pleasure of sending Dr. Abbot a full scheme of these chapters, including those of the Cod. Amiatinus; the results (as far as they are worth anything) are summarized in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars (No. 29, March, 1884).

P. 203. In placing and dating the Greek Psalter, which contains the earliest printed Greek fragments of N. T., there seems to be an error in the words 'Venetiis anno 1486.' Is there not a Greek-Latin Psalter published at Milan in 1481 which contains the Canticles of Luke I? (I was offered a copy last summer.) The mistake seems to have arisen in Davidson's *Biblical Criticism*, II, p. 106, followed by Tregelles, *Printed Text*, p. 2 note, where he says, "The first part of the Greek Testament which was printed consisted of the thanksgiving hymns of Mary and Zacharias (Luke I 42-56, 68-80) appended to a Greek Psalter published in 1486."

On p. 366 note, read *Eberhardus* for *Eduardus*.

In describing the uncial MSS it is impossible to decide for other people what should be inserted; but one can hardly avoid a suggestion that it would be well always to give as full references as possible to the places where reproductions of any portions of a text may be found. Thus the number of the plate representing a MS in the Paleographical Society's work should be given. Montfaucon, for example, gives two specimens of Cod. A, one, apparently, from the Psalter, as given by Walton, and another from a specimen sent him by Grabe (Pal. Gr. p. 213, 513, 514). There is also one of the same

MS in Astle, p. 66, consisting of a few lines from John, c. 1. These references are the more valuable, as Dr. Gregory gives no facsimiles at all, and the only approach to them consists in the use of Tischendorf's uncial type (p. 343, 344) for four of the leading uncials, the effect of which is to leave on the mind a dull impression that all early MSS must have been remarkably alike. And further, the importance of such references or reproductions is not diminished by the fact that text-books in common use, like Scrivener's Introduction, give a very poor idea of the MSS which they honor by a line or two of indifferent imitation. There are many facsimiles accessible to persons who cannot afford to purchase the plates of the Paleographical Society. For instance, at my elbow is Wrangham's reprint of Walton's Prolegomena; it contains specimens of A, B, D, N, Z, E^{act} etc. A facsimile may also be found of Cod. C in Montfaucon, and of Cod. D in Astle, and many similar references might be given.

On p. 358. In describing Cod. B, we are told that the MS. is written "ternis columnis et lineis 42 in singulis paginis." And it is evident from what follows that the description is of the whole MS and not merely of the New Testament part of it; neither of these statements is universally true; the latter one should be mended by the remark that in the whole of the Pentateuch, *nisi fallor*, and in 1 Reg. to XIX 11 there are 44 lines to a column, and in 2 Paralip. X 66-XXVI 13 there are 40 lines to a column. Similar corrections will be found necessary in the descriptions of other codices; the fact is that these are too much condensed to enable one to rely upon them without occasional reference to other books.

We might write much more as to the details of the various uncials described; but when we had finished, it would be sufficiently clear that we had really diverged into other matters than those contained in the prolegomena because the faults of the book were too few to furnish the basis for a substantial criticism, and that we were not really reviewing, but writing portions of a new book of our own. Dr. Gregory's work is in every way sure to win the highest praise.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Analecta Isocratea. Composuit BRUNO KEIL. Praga, F. Tempsky; Lipsiae, G. Freytag. MDCCCLXXXV.

In the *Analecta Isocratea* of Keil we have the complete work, of which the doctor-dissertation of the author had only presented a specimen. The introductory part gives a brief account of the life and works of Isokrates, in which especial stress is laid on the attitude of the orator to the tragic poets of his day. A sworn foe to the later dramatists, he tried to be for his generation what the older tragic poets had been for theirs, and while appropriating some of their devices, he developed a rhythm that rivalled verse without coinciding with it, and treated themes that were on as high a level as those of the tragic Muse.

The bulk of the book is made up of references to the authors by whom passages of Isokrates have been quoted, with critical notes on the more important divergences from our MSS of Isokrates, and occasional remarks on subject matter and diction, showing close study of the orator. So we are told (p. 57)